

Text 9/5 - 7/12/72 - 7/12/72 11:15

1/4/72

Dear Jim,

As soon as I felt your 12/29 I knew something had to be wrong. Thinkest in recollection.

Either we are tougher than you or vaccination works. My own ST, insists that is how we got it but if so, what an extraordinary incubation period! Ours had to be British because I pinpoint Ian's was party as inseminator. (When first reporter in the east it was London rather than British. The way it is abusing the two of you, let's be generous and name it as here, after the SOG (Hooverese: Seat of Government, his ref to self!).

I don't have Freep 12/22 Wecht and would probably like to for the completeness of that file. His first "serious" writing was in Modern Medicine, really a crappy piece but consistent with my belief that he is an exploiter. He wants to reach the lawyers and the CP's with business solicitations. I still feel he'll come out with something in a more serious journal unless he is rejected, and irresponsible as he has been, that is not impossible now.

The Garrison statement in that issue, if it is only his statement, don't bother. I have the OFFICIAL version. Sht! However, if they drooled over him, I might like to file the sputum.

Pugs again: there may be this difference: Lil has been pumping us both full of so many different vitamins and so many of them I don't even ask. First thing she gives me once she is ambulatory is a shot-glass of 'em. Last thing before she went to bed last night, too. Only, after breakfast, just a couple of whatever. It is still audible in me, I'm still full of stuff, but the weakness, except from inactivity, has passed. Now it is just from physical inactivity. Yet I don't dare work up a sweat while it lingers. Lil's vitamins don't come from the drug store? She gets them from a natural-foods place (when they are on sale). She was strong on C before Pauling, as I was with my chickens. That long ago!

Howard will be glad to read the Gehlen/Schurman when he gets here next week. His own view is that the left is hungup on its past and lacks full understanding. I'll know more about his thinking, based on his studies plus his independent thinking, when we talk about it. If this is not a fair reflection of his view, it is of mine. Their attitude toward JFK and the inner thoughts he held at the end and the real meaning and intent of what he did at the end is but one-if a conspicuous-example. This is the first of that pair's that, if still excellent and incomparably better than I've seen elsewhere, I can still take issue with. Thus I'm happy for the full text.

I've not had a chance to think it all through, either their peice or the situation.

For openers, how about conceiving that the bombing of the French mission was not ordered by Nixon but was, instead, a military venture to see what he'd take in silence? It is a rarity when you get a militarist who is also a deep political thinker. I think that they merely shade politicians and conceive they all come from the same mold. So, in this thinking, they fail to understand his real objective as I do, establishing an Authoritarianism.

G and S, like everyone else I've heard or read, omit reference to another possible purpose served by this latest and greatest bestiality, having nothing to do with its local purposes: to tell the world this is what I am capable of, so don't forget. And my people do what I tell them to do, regardless of cost (if for no other reason, the bombing had to end before there was revolt in the pilot and crew forces). He dash't drop The Bomb, because he can't survive it. So, he has to be able to or feel he is able to work his will another way, the Ameriform Hitler's, terror. He has made this point! (Palme in this context, too, if also others?)

I don't want to take the time to ^{detail} ^{mont} disagree with their Dien version. JFK was separated from that assassination. Otherwise, he'd not have planned Chicago or would have gone, for he'd have been prepared. That simple for those who wpn't think as I do. The last thing the practical pro would do is antagonize Daley needlessly, and for the second time. The CIA, not JFK, did it. He had already decided to get out. (Howard says he may have some of my old Escalatio file. "Ope so.") JFK's new policy was most visible in Dominican Republic.

He was into too many complexities to have his fingers on all. (Another reason Nixon is spidering his think-alikers throughout the government at next to and top level, where they can do what he wants done, regardless of who runs agency in name.)

G/S have examined all of this out of special context, Nixon's exceptional election behavior, where he sacrificed everything to an overwhelming majority. He wanted to establish himself more than anything else, more than just winning. (WG in this context, otherwise it served no purpose.)

and the consideration I alone seem to be articulating: irrationality. Remember how

back I was speaking of Strangelovers? Maybe a political shrink could invent a term, "Nixonphrenia"? In this sense, please consider what I've been noting about incredible political behavior, like destroying the basis for the traditional GOP rural base with unheard of and unnecessary political stupidities and harshness, which would be practised only for reserving the diminishing national pelf for the military--and only if his great concern were not the electoral success of the GOP in the future.

Aside from literal madness, what else can explain the seemingly insane things he is up to, even what he had to know was stupid isolation from the Congress when he could have conned them by merely seeing them, as JFK and LBJ did. He knows he can't cope with the multitudinous problems he and the country face. So, the Great Vipier is resorting to the traditional: turmoil and a continuation of foreign adventures, or invoking "patriotism". Everybody has to "sacrifice". Like Phase II and his downplayed sale of a single building lot for a six-figure profit. Some Phase II! But close to total silence on it. And none with reference to what he has imposed on the working population.

My own view is that we have ~~xxx~~ madman, backed up by a silent Agnew who has never before been silent.

Disagree with their formulation that he is leaning more to the right. He hasn't changed. His superficial poses and his need have, but not his views and not, basically, any of his acts. Curswell, Haynesworth, Burger, "ehnnquist, Blackmun are all preparation and farright, each and all, all not new. So with all his appointments to power.

If not in itself in my view as significant and determining as they make it, they have a real point in the Navy. With the new tranquility with China, the end of VN operations does what they do no say, cast the Navy in a minor role when it is screaming for the useless and frightfully expensive nuke carriers and all those planes, without which so many ~~xxxxx~~ careers in the military and after retirement will end so fast. There is no need for all the 7th fleet to "protect" Thailand. With USSR detente, less need for the Sixth as it is. So, they are heating up the job.

Other interpretations of the massive resupply during the temporary lull are immediately visible: how else keep the whole country from screaming about dumping all that stuff the SVN's couldn't use on them? (Same thing happened first cease fire, by the way.) All will have to be replaced, and all will be available for other similar situations throughout the world. No way of keeping Thieu or successors from selling or giving all that stuff. Whatever happens now or soon.

Except in the sense of its volume vs NVN, this is not a "new type of war". It is one US alone practised in WWII, with remarkable selectivity, wiping out all German factories not US owned and miraculously letting US-owned ones stand. Neither USSR nor Britain did it. The capabilities of the B52s made a volumetric difference only. (p.1)

I don't think that at the time of the October deal the NVN and ~~xxx~~ had the capability of "mounting a final offensive." A larger and costly one, sure. But not "final". (p.1)

Nixon's credibility throughout the world does not rest on his ever having been credible in the customary sense but on his a) power and b) willingness to use it. No more, and I don't think he is or was concerned about being thought ill of or not being believed. (2)

JFK earlier wanted US control (4). But at the end, only to arrange our exit. His need was to get past the election, LBJ's on the other extreme.

It Thieu made a deal with the "enemy", assuming he'd survive it, how would it hurt Nixon, unless it is Nixon's determination to remain there at all costs? If so, what about the quote on "credibility"? He has to know he can't win. Thieu can't blackmail Nixon. Nixon put him in a position to, as LBJ did, but only so it could appear that way as long as that serves US purposes. He'll be offed whenever it is wanted and he can't blackmail. I think that whole situation was deliberately contrived, copied from LBJ's day. (5)

His Navy point (6) could be strengthened by remembering they do not have to invest manpower on land and have no naval opposition. They've got it made for safety. New world for the unbrave, for them brave new world and such wondrous wogs in it!

These fine thinkers are thinking in the past, not the present or the future, like those I know at IPS, hungup on their great thinking and work of the past and unable to see past it in their own minds....Glad to have something like this at this time to make me think a bit, if still in too much haste. Thanks,